C O N C O R D I A U N I V E R S I T Y

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

M I N U T E S

(of SRC meeting held on Thursday, April 16, 1992
at 10:00 A.M., in Room BC-110, SGW campus)

ATTENDANCE -

Members present:	P. Bird, D. Ginter, J.N. Lightstone (Chair), D. Markiewicz, P. Shizgal, A. Williams, Evelyne Loo (Secretary)
Guest:	Me M. Gamache, John Relton
Absent with regrets:	V. Baba, U. De Brentani, R. Parker, S. Sankar, T.S. Sankar, C. Zucker
Absent:	E. Doedel, M. Haque, J. Surette, A. Zaidi

Dr. Jack N. Lightstone occupied the Chair.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

The Chair thanked Me. Michèle Gamache and Mr. John Relton for having kindly accepted to join the SRC Committee.

1.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by the Committee.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes for the last meetings have been approved with some minor corrections.

3.0 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair informed Committee members that at the last Senate Meeting the Rector, the Chairman of the Board and Dr. Sheinin were asked to appear in Senate to answer questions about the procedures leading to the appointment of Dean of Commerce and Administration. The remainder of the meeting was to deal with the guidelines for periodical appraisal of academic units, which document was tabled until the May 26th meeting of Senate.

The document "Facilitative Processes for the Implementation of the Policy Document entitled 'The Enhancement of Research at Concordia University'" is now before SCAPP. At various junctures both at SCAPP and elsewhere the deans, the Vice-Rector, Academic, the Vice-Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance (VR,IR&F) and the Associate VR, IR&F have all now voiced agreement with the documents principal proposals, including the move to a five-year rolling budget. SCAPP has committed to devising for next fall appropriate procedures for planning and budgeting which will implement these principles.

4.0 REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR, ORS

A.J. Williams announced that the NSERC and FCAR results are out, the success rates have increased from 41% to 58.1%. The candidates have done well in NSERC, there is a high percentage of SSHRC-4As (25% of our applicants) in addition to those who were successful in the SSHRC competitions (38.5%).

P. Shizgal asked if the number of applications to SSHRC has increased and about the success-rate of last year's 4As and whether this year's 4As will be helped, as they were last year.

A.J. Williams: Yes, the total number of applications has gone up this year as it had the previous year. Over half of last year's 4As were successful; about eight who applied last year did not make it. Precise figures regarding what happened to last year's 4As will be compiled. Dr. Lightstone in conjunction with the deans will try to provide Bridge Funding to this year's 4As.

Chair pointed out that over the past two years the number of SSHRC applications in the University has doubled. All the FRDP grantees are aware that they should apply as soon as possible to an external grant and this is a condition for all the 4As who have received bridge funding. The number of grantsmanship workshops has also increased.

5.0 THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY.

The Chair reminded the Committee of those principles, previously discussed by the Committee, which had informed his attempt at an initial draft.

1 For this document to be useful from a legal point of view, it has to give clear definitions of what infractions will/could be subject to proceedings.

2 While procedures are under way, everything must be done to guard the reputations of both the accuser and the accused.

3 What was recommended was a two stage process. A standing committee will make an initial judgment as to whether there is sufficient substance to the allegations to warrant a full enquiry. If that standing committee finds that there is enough substance to proceed, another panel will investigate.

4 An appeal procedure at both stages.

Bird expressed his initial reaction, the language is already legal nevertheless he has some reservations. What if the accused just "won't give the time of the day." The accused may decide neither to admit nor to deny the charges.

Chair agreed that procedures should allow for the possibility of no response at all without prejudice to the accused and without blocking procedures. The accused may decide to do nothing in response, neither to admit nor to deny.

Peter Shizgal expressed his concerns about the ownership of research data, how must a researcher keep it, what is the proper attribution to contribution.

Relton: Some protocol must be clear concerning who the data belong to, who is responsible, and how long data should be kept.

John Relton remarked that it should be appropriate to set up a menu, to pull out guidelines from other universities such as McGill, Harvard, University of Toronto and our procedures should be capable of dealing with any allegations of academic misconduct.

5.0 THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY.

Peter Shizgal questioned the manner in which the Standing Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee will be constituted.

Chair noted that the Vice-Rector, Academic is manager of the system but not at any point the judging jury. The other thing is the people who hear the appeal in the second instance are not the same as those who hear it in the first instance. The logic is that if you have already heard an appeal on the case, you have formed an opinion; it makes no sense to have the second appeal go to the same people and again you cannot have the same panel. The issue of who appoints who is an open and major question sure. For example is the model of the Collective agreement's joint grievance committee an appropriate alternative model.

Chair remarked that one might also reconsider whether an appeal should be allowed at the first stage only if the standing committee decision is not to proceed.

John Relton suggested changing the appeal mechanism body make-up, since by placing Me Bérengère Gaudet and himself in the decision making situation will wipe out their capacity as advisory to the process. He offered the parallel of the appeal process at the level of the Board of Governors, which has an appeal committee of which Me Bérengère Gaudet is secretary, and they can nominate the Vice-Rector, Academic as an additional member.

It was agreed that Mr. Relton, in consultation with Me. M. Gamache would produce over the summer the next draft of the document and will return to the SRC for study in the early Fall.

6.0 Input to Task Force on Enhancement of University-wide Research Support Facilities

Chair will pass on an appropriate worded letter to the Task Force with copy to Mr John Noonan, Secretary of Senate.

The Vice-Rector, Academic has appointed Dr. D. Gold, director of CRDH as director of the Task Force and designated the Associate Vice-Rector, Academic (Research) as her delegate on the Committee.

7.0 Varia

D. Ginter, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Chair for his conduct of the SRC meetings over the last three years.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be announced in September 1992.

9.0 Adjournment

The Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.